DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 385 615 UD 030 503

AUTHOR Grannis, Joseph C.; Springer, Carolyn M.
TITLE The Full-Year Attendance of Community Achievement Project Students in the Teachers College Evaluation Sample for 1992-93: A Follow-Up Study.
PUB DATE Jul 95
NOTE 23p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Attendance; Community Involvement; *Dropout Prevention; *Educational Change; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

In 1992-93 the United Way was managing the participation of community-based organizations in the New York City Board of Education's dropout prevention effort. The Teachers College of Columbia University was asked to undertake an evaluation of this program, the Community Achievement Project in the Schools (CAPS). A follow-up to the original evaluation, the present study used full-year attendance data for both the 1991-92 and 1992-93 school years. Data were obtained for over 90 percent of the 640 students in the original evaluation sample. Analyses of the proportions of students in various subsamples whose attendance improved, stayed the same or did not improve found different results for different samples. In general, CAPS did not meet its goal of attendance improvement from at least 50 percent of the student population, although the goal was reached with the elementary school student population. To test the fall attendance as a predictor of a full-year outcome, fall and full-year attendance figures were studied. The change between attendance rates in the fall and the prior year was a strong predictor of change in attendance for the two full years. The trajectory traced by these results can be used to monitor individual students and to develop different ways to improve attendance. Five tables present study findings. (Contains two references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 385 615

The Full-Year Attendance of Community Achievement Project Students in the Teachers College Evaluation Sample for 1992-93: A Follow-Up Study

Joseph C. Grannis
Teachers College, Columbia University

Carolyn M. Springer
Academy for Educational Development

July, 1995

CG030503

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Grannis
Teachers College
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1992-93, the United Way was continuing to manage the participation of community based organizations in the Board of Educations's dropout prevention effort. Teachers College (TC) was asked to conduct an evaluation of this program, the Community Achievement Project in the Schools (CAPS). One of the quantitative findings of the evaluation was that for students for whom data were available for both the Fall 1991 and Fall 1992 semesters, mid-year attendance showed gains in the positive direction.

The evaluators characterized this comparison of the Fall 1991 and Fall 1992 attendance as a "trajectory," and hypothesized that it should predict how well students would do in the full 1992-93 school year compared with the prior year, when most of this cohort was not yet in the CAPS program.

A follow-up study was conducted using full-year attendance data for both the 1991-92 and 1992-93 school years. The Office of Education Research (OER) of the Board of Education was able to match IDs for over 90% of the 640 students in the evaluation sample and to furnish computerized data for a substantial proportion of the students for whom TC had collected data in the schools by hand.

Two sets of analyses of these data were carried out. The first set of analyses examined the proportions of students in various subsamples whose attendance improved, stayed the same or did not improve between 1991-92 and 1992-93. Calculations were based on five samples- 1) student attendance data available from schools at the time that TC conducted the evaluation study (i.e., the available data subsample), 2) Fall Board of Education attendance data for students who were in the available data subsample, 3) full Year Board of Education attendance data for students who were in the available data subsample, 4) Fall Board of Education attendance data for the original TC sample of 640 CAPS students (the available subsample plus other students for whom data had not been available in the schools), and 5) full Year Board of Education attendance data for the original TC sample.

Different results were obtained with the different samples. Factors that were postulated to account for this included underrepresentation of elementary students in Board of Education data, different methods of calculating the attendance rate, data collection errors and discrepancies in student data between school and central records.

In general, CAPS did not meet the attendance goal of at least 50% of program students improving their attendance for the 1992-93 school year. However, there were differences by school level. Across all samples, elementary students evidenced the most gain in attendance and high school students the least. Elementary school students achieved the 50% attendance goal in all five samples and middle school students met this criterion in three of the five samples. High school students did not meet the 50% attendance goal

in any of the five samples.

Considering the three school levels separately, for the sample for which TC had data, the evaluators were correct in predicting--to the extent that "trajectory" had this implication--that the elementary and the middle schools, but not the high schools, would meet the Chancellor's goal for attendance. At the same time, the exact percents of gain were much lower in the analyses with Board data than they had appeared to be with the TC data and analysis.

The second set of analyses examined the relationship between Fall and full Year attendance change rates, in order to test the concept of a fall trajectory as a predictor of a full-year outcome. A series of correlational analyses were computed using the most inclusive sample--all students from the original evaluation sample for whom the Board had data.

Fall 1991 attendance rate correlated substantially more highly with Year 1991-92 attendance rate than with any other rate in the set. Likewise, Fall 1992 attendance rate correlated more highly with Year 1992-93 attendance rate than with any other rate in the set. Fall and full Year rate changes were also found to correlate highly. These patterns were found to hold for elementary, middle and high schools, though the correlation was somewhat lower for the middle schools.

It was concluded that the change between attendance rates in the fall semester of a year and the prior year is a strong predictor of the change between the attendance rates for the two full years in question. Students who were gaining in attendance rate at midyear were likely to have gained in attendance rate for the whole year compared to the year before, and students whose attendance rates were declining were likely to have declined at the year's end.

The midyear results overall and by school level were a strong indicator of whether the proportion of students improving their rate of attendance at the end of the program year is likely to be higher or lower than it was the prior year. This validates the use of a trajectory for formative evaluation of programs at midyear, or before end-of-year results are available.

The trajectory can be used to monitor the attendance of individual students, to recognize students whose attendance has improved, and to consider ways to intervene in those cases where students' attendance is not changing positively. Fall attendance change cannot be relied upon as the only indicator, but it can be important information to consider.

To use the trajectory in these ways argues for data being available on line to school and CBO staff working with the students, as well as to evaluators at midyear. Making the data more accessible on-line in the schools could offset data errors at

the school level as well as the discrepancy between school and central records. Monitoring and supporting students' attendance is an important component of any effective dropout prevention initiative.

The data for the largest subset of the evaluation sample, all students for whom attendance data were available for both years, show that attendance rates in the program year were lower than in the prior year for the majority of both middle school and high school students participating in CAPS in 1992-93. The effectiveness of the dropout prevention initiative at these levels may depend on more fundamental changes in the structure, program, and climate of the secondary schools than CAPS and Project Achieve alone are able to effect.

In July, 1993, Teachers College (TC) submitted to the United Way of New York City and the New York City Board of Education a Final Report on the evaluation of the Community Achievement Project in the Schools (CAPS) for 1992-93.[1] Through CAPS, the United Way had managed the participation of community based organizations (CBOs) in the school system's dropout prevention initiative. Among a variety of findings, one of the most salient was the following:

> As of midyear, attendance was moving in a positive direction for those students for whom both Fall 1991 and Fall 1992 attendance data were obtained. (Grannis, Meier & Springer, 1993, p. 3)

The evaluators characterized this comparison of the Fall 1991 and Fall 1992 attendance as a "trajectory," and argued that it should predict how well students would do in the full 1992-93 school year compared with the prior year, when most of this cohort was not yet in the CAPS program. As the quotation above implies, this comparison involved only students in CAPS in 1992-93 for whom Fall attendance data for both years could be obtained; it was not a comparison of the means of 1992-93 CAPS participants with the means of a 1991-92 cohort of CAPS participants.

Since submitting this report, the evaluators have wondered how valid and accurate the trajectory was. They therefore requested that the Office of Education Research (OER) of the Board of Education furnish TC with the full-year attendance data for both 1991-92 and 1992-93 for the evaluation sample. Since TC already had permission to access these data for the original evaluation, Dr. Robert Tobias released the data and Mr. Shaun Britton, on time that was partly funded by the investigators and partly volunteered, retrieved the data from Board of Education systems. For this, TC was able to furnish the 9 digit IDs, birth dates, and school codes for the evaluation sample of 640 students. The Board was able to match IDs for over 90% of the sample and to furnish computerized data for a substantial proportion of the students for whom TC had collected data in the schools by hand.

We have conducted two sets of analyses of these data. The first set has examined the proportions of students in various subsamples whose attendance appears to have improved or not improved between 1991-92 and 1992-93. We say "appears" because of various questions about the data and the calculations that will be

---

[1] Grannis, Joseph C., Meier, Ellen B., & Springer, Carolyn M. (1993). Evaluation of the Community Achievement Project in the Schools: A collaboration of the United Way and the New York City Public Schools. New York, NY: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

discussed in this report. The second set of analyses has calculated the correlations between Fall and full Year attendance change rates, in order to test the concept of a fall trajectory as a predictor of a full-year outcome. This report presents our new findings.

It will simplify matters to state at the outset that all of the analyses with Board of Education data show lower proportions of students improving their attendance between the prior year and the program year than the Teachers College data had suggested. The reasons for this, however, are instructive. Secondly, and quite separately from this first result, our analyses confirm the utility of calculating a $Fall_1$-$Fall_2$ trajectory as a predictor of $Year_1$-$Year_2$ direction of change.

Rates of change for different subsets of the evaluation sample

Table 1 presents the results of analyses with five data sets; "Fall" stands for the first semester of the school year, while "Year" represents the full school year:

Fall TC includes 380 students for whom we ourselves were able to collect attendance data for both Fall 1991 and Fall 1992. These data were found in the CAPS school sites directly and were analyzed for the July 1993 Final Report. Out of the total evaluation sample of 640 students, there were additional students for whom Fall 1992 data were found in the schools, but not Fall 1991 data, so they could not be included in the analysis reported.

Fall OER_T uses the Office of Education Research's Fall 1991 and Fall 1992 attendance data for 350 of the 380 students for whom TC had Fall data.

Year OER_T uses OER's full-year data for 1991-92 and 1992-93, this time for 334 of the 380 students TC had Fall data for; these are data that could not be collected at the time of the evaluation, in Spring 1993, before the end of the school year.

Fall OER_S includes $Fall_1$-$Fall_2$ data for not only the 334 students in the **Year OER_T** subsample, but for an additional 131 students that were in the original TC sample of 640, but for whom TC had not found $Fall_1$-$Fall_2$ attendance data in the schools.

Year OER_S uses $Year_1$-$Year_2$ data for the same subsample that is included in the **Fall OER_S** analysis.

Because there was less computerization of student data at the elementary level, the TC elementary sample is underrepresented in all three analyses with OER data. Elementary school students were

22% of the sample that TC was able to collect data for by hand, while they were only 14% of the largest OER sample. This weights the overall findings with OER data more toward the outcomes for middle and high school students, which in all five analyses turn out to show lower attendance gains than the outcomes for elementary school students.

Table 1 presents the findings for the relevant samples overall and then for the three school levels separately, elementary, middle school, and high school. Each panel shows the percent of students whose attendance was found to gain in each analysis, and the percent whose attendance was a loss. Gain and loss do not add up to a full 100%, mostly at the high school level, because there was a very small percent of students for whom there was no change between the two fall semesters or the two full years.

It will be seen that overall and at each school level, the gains get progressively lower and the losses get correspondingly higher as one moves through the five analyses.

With the data our staff themselves collected in the schools, we found that 53% of the students gained in the proportion of days attended in the first semester of the program year compared with Fall in the prior year, while 45% had attendance losses. When we break this down by school level, however (as TC did in its report two years ago), the results are quite different. Focusing just on the attendance rate gains, the results show 73% of the elementary students gaining in Fall 1992 over Fall 1991, and 56% of the middle school students gaining, but only 40% of the high school students in CAPS gaining between the two fall semesters. Both the elementary and the middle school gains were higher than had been reported for these levels of school in earlier dropout prevention program evaluations, while the high school finding of just 40% gaining was almost the same as what TC had found in the last year of the Dropout Prevention Initiative (DPI) evaluation, when 39% of the high school students had attendance gains.[2]

Next, we again compare Fall 1992 with Fall 1991 for these same students, but this time using the data that OER supplied to us this winter. Overall, the proportion of students improving attendance drops to 47%, and the proportion losing in attendance rises to 52%. At the elementary level, gain drops to 65%, at the middle school level gain is 52%, and for high school it is 37%.

Third, we look at results for the whole program year compared

---

[2] Grannis, Joseph C., & Riehl, Carolyn, with others (1989). Evaluation of the New York City Dropout Prevention Initiative, Final Report on the High Schools for Year Three, 1987-88. New York, NY: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

with the prior year, again for those students out of the 380 TC had collected Fall data for, but using the Board of Education's data. Here we are comparing CAPS students' rate of attendance in 1992-93 with the same individuals' attendance in the prior year, 1991-92. Overall, the proportion gaining drops to 45%, and the students with losses rises to 54%. At the elementary level, the proportion gaining is now 64%, in the middle schools it is just 50%, and in the high schools it falls to 35%.

The fourth analysis examines the Fall to Fall change for all students in TC's original sample of 640 for whom OER had both Fall and Year data. Overall, 45% of these students gained between Fall 1991 and Fall 1992, while 54% had lower attendance in the program year than the year before. In the elementary school sample, 60% of the students gained, in the middle schools 48% gained, and in the high schools 38% gained.

Finally, we again look at full Year changes, and as with the last analysis, include all students from TC's sample of 640 for whom the Board had attendance data. Gain drops to 42% overall, rises to 64% for elementary, drops to 43% in the middle schools, and falls to 35% for the high schools.

What accounts for the differences between the Teachers College data and the Board of Education data?

A number of factors entered into the differences between results with the different data sets. [3]

First, the underrepresentation of elementary students from the TC sample in the OER sample, reflecting the fact that less of the elementary data in the schools has been computerized, is one factor causing the overall percent of students gaining attendance to be lower with the **OER Fall,** sample than with the TC Fall sample.

Second, a major factor contributing to the lower rates of all four analyses with Board computer data compared to the original analysis with our hand-collected data is a different method we used to calculate the number of days students were present. OER

---

[3] It was difficult to find an appropriate statistical test to determine if the observed differences between the proportions of corresponding samples were statistically significant. The z-test for two independent proportions assumes that the proportions being tested are not related in any way; this assumption was violated because the samples contain some of the same students. It is possible that a chi-square test for non-independent samples might work; the investigators are checking on this as well as other non-parametric tests.

subtracts days absent from the days a student was on register for the given semester or year, and TC has now used this formula for all four analyses with OER data. However, TC had not included registration dates in the original data collection in the schools. These dates were even less accessible to us than the attendance data, though we did get the dates students entered the CAPS program from the CAPS intake forms. We therefore subtracted days absent from the total number of attendance days in the calendar for the school level and district in question. This inflated some students' days present, particularly during the program year. It is clear that the method we used for the Final Report was invalid, which we did not appreciate at the time.[4]

Third, from listing out the data for a sample of individual students, and also consulting copies we retained of our original data collection forms, we have discovered a couple of other factors. One is that, in a few cases, a student's absences for the whole prior Year of 1991-92 were recorded as Fall semester absences, either in the original data collection in the school or when it was entered into TC's computer file. We tried to avoid this, but some mistakes occurred.

Another factor revealed by case listing is that, in the program year especially, there are many instances in some schools where OER shows more days absent for the Fall than was found in the school records directly. A guess from earlier observations in the DPI is that when a student comes in late, or later brings a written excuse, his or her attendance is changed in a school record, but has already been reported as an absence in the data submitted to the Board via computer early in the day in question.

There are also numerous discrepancies between our own data for the Fall and the OER data that do not at this time have an interpretable pattern. Since our data were based on records found in the schools, one cannot simply assume that these data are invalid while the OER data are accurate, but neither can the opposite of this be assumed. As we noted in our Final Report, the collection of attendance data in the schools had been unexpectedly difficult. Current year attendance data were the most accessible to TC, but even in this case CBOs' access to the data varied a lot between schools. For prior year attendance (and for report card grades in both years), different combinations of school printouts, permanent record folders, report cards, or section sheets, had to be located in virtually every school. We will comment further on this in the final section of this report.

---

[4] This error had not been made in the Teachers College evaluation of the Dropout Prevention Initiative, which had the students' date of registration available to include in the calculation.

How do the new findings alter our conclusions about CAPS meeting the Chancellor's attendance goal?

We note that even with OER's Fall-Fall and full-Year data for the students TC had found Fall data for in the schools, the elementary and the middle schools still were achieving the goal of at least 50% of program students improving their attendance. Sixty-four percent (64%) of the elementary school students in this sample and 50% of the sample middle school students gained in rate of attendance for 1992-93 compared with their rate for 1991-92. Only 35% of the high school students in this subsample gained in attendance between 1991-92 and 1992-93, but our 1993 Final Report had not claimed that the goal was met at the high school level.

Considering the three school levels separately, <u>for the sample for which TC had data,</u> we were correct in predicting--to the extent that "trajectory" had this implication--that the elementary and the middle schools, but not the high schools, would meet the Chancellor's goal for attendance. At the same time, the exact percents of gain were much lower in the analyses with OER data than they had appeared to be with the TC data and analysis. For the middle schools, 50% is hardly the robust result that 56% had seemed to be.

The results using the Board of Education's data for all students in the original TC sample clearly indicate that both the middle and the high school programs were losing attendance in the Fall semester of the program year compared to the previous Fall, and that the losses worsened by the end of the program Year. The elementary school programs, by contrast, were making a positive difference to attendance in the Fall semester, and may even have strengthened this outcome by the end of the Year, when the percent of students improving their attendance (64%) increased over what it had been for this sample (60%) at midyear.

TC's Final Report claimed that 53% of the students in the sample <u>overall</u> gained in Fall 1992-93 attendance compared with Fall 1991-92 attendance, whereas all four of the comparisons using Board data show less than 50% of the students overall gaining in attendance between the two fall semesters or the two full years. This difference reflects the various factors explicated above. On balance, however, we have to conclude that CAPS did not meet the attendance goal overall for the 1992-93 school year.

How well does the idea of a trajectory hold up?

Using just the Board's data for the Fall and the full-Year attendance of TC's Fall sample--analyses with the **Fall OER$_T$** and **Year OER$_T$** data sets--the fall gains and losses were generally just one or two percentage points different from the full-year gains or

losses. For the larger set of all students for whom the Board had attendance data, the differences between fall and full-year gains or losses were somewhat larger, around 4%. At least at this gross level of analysis, these figures provide some encouragement for the idea of comparing the fall attendance for the two years to predict a trajectory for the full two years' attendance. It was to test this idea more exactly that we conducted a second set of analyses.

Correlations of Fall data with full-year data

We have done a series of correlational analyses that test the idea of the trajectory more specifically. Tables 2A-2D present the intercorrelations of nine attendance variables: attendance rates for Fall 1991, Spring 1992, Fall 1992, Spring 1993, Year 1991-92, and Year 1992-93, and rates of attendance change between 1991-92 and 1992-93 for Fall, Spring, and full Year. The analyses reported here are for our most inclusive sample, the 465 students from the original TC sample of 640 for whom the Board had computerized attendance data. The Fall 1991 attendance rate can be seen to correlate substantially more highly with Year 1991-92 attendance rate ($r = .83$) than with any other rate in the set. Likewise, Fall 1992 attendance rate correlates more highly with Year 1992-93 attendance rate ($r = .91$) than with any other rate in the set. These observations apply at all three levels--elementary, middle school, and high school--although we note that the correlation was somewhat lower at the middle school level in 1991-92 ($r = .70$) than the general pattern of correlations summarized above. It should also be noted that Fall attendance and Year attendance have a part-whole relationship.[5]

To obtain change of rate, we subtracted the relevant prior year attendance rate from the relevant program year attendance rate--Fall 1991 rate from Fall 1992 rate and Year 1991-92 from Year 1992-93. It can be seen in Table 2A that the Fall and the full Year rate changes correlate .79 ($n = 465$, $p < .001$). At $r = .81$, the correlation of the Spring change rate with the full Year change is virtually the same.

Analyses of the data at each school level separately continued to find strong correlations (See Tables 2B - 2D). At the elementary level, the correlation between Fall change of rate and full Year change was .80 ($n = 63$, $p < .001$). At the middle school level, the correlation was .80 ($n = 208$, $p < .001$). At the high school level, the correlation was .76 ($n = 194$, $p < .001$). Since Spring attendance change is theoretically independent of Fall

---

[5] Trials of hypothetical data sets have led us to think that the lower limit of their correlation (assuming an equal number of days in Fall and Spring) is $r = .50$. We have not yet established this limit formally.

attendance rate change with full Year attendance rate change have a much greater range.[6] Thus the correlations that these analyses have obtained have to be regarded as highly meaningful as well as highly significant.

We conclude from these findings that the change between attendance rates in the fall semester of a year and the prior year is a strong predictor of the change between the attendance rates for the two full years in question. Students who were gaining in attendance rate at midyear were likely to have gained in attendance rate for the whole year compared to the year before, and students whose attendance rates were declining were likely to have declined at the year's end. Though this might seem to be intuitively obvious to begin with, we are not aware of school systems or evaluators using midyear attendance change calculations to judge midyear program effect or student progress.

Implications of the findings.

The advantages of calculating students' attendance rate gain or loss at midyear relative to the previous fall are twofold. First, the midyear results overall and by school level turn out to be a strong indicator of whether the proportion of students improving their rate of attendance at the end of the program year is likely to be higher or lower than it was the prior year. This then validates the trajectory, as we have called it, for formative evaluation of the program in question at midyear, or before end-of-year results are available. Having claimed this on statistical grounds, we do have to point out that the meaning of the trajectory depends also on the evaluation's establishing that the students were enrolled in the program early enough in the fall for the program to have had an impact on the students during the fall, and that the program was indeed implemented.

Secondly, the trajectory can be used to monitor the attendance of individual students, to recognize students whose attendance has improved, and to consider ways to intervene in those cases where students' attendance is not changing positively. Fall attendance change could not be relied upon as the only indicator, but it would be important information to include in a holistic picture. One could hope that for some students the program in the Spring would make such a difference that Fall attendance was weakened as a predictor of the Year's attendance. In other words, the program would interrupt the correlation that might otherwise obtain. This is similar to the rationale of More Effective Schools, which strive

[6] We think this range is between r = -.50 and r = 1.00, though again we have yet to demonstrate this formally.

to overcome the negative prediction made for students by certain indicators.

To use the trajectory in these ways, however, does presume that the data will be available on line to school and CBO staff working with the students, as well as to evaluators at midyear. This was decidedly not the case when TC attempted to obtain attendance (and course grades) data in Spring 1993. Prior year attendance and grades were particularly difficult to access. This argues both for accelerating the computerization of student performance data and increasing access to the data for staff working with the students in the schools. The day could come when the calculations used for this research, which afterall are relatively straightforward and simple to perform (provided that registration date has been taken into account!), could be routinely requested by staff, so that the trajectory would be reported to staff directly.

The data TC originally collected in the schools overestimated the percent of students improving their attendance at each school level, but this was due partly to errors that could easily be avoided the next time. Making the data more accessible on-line in the schools would greatly facilitate this process, first of all for staff who are working with the students. This might lead also to reconciliation of records on students, where school and central records appear to diverge.

The data for the largest subset of the evaluation sample, all students for whom attendance data were available for both years, show that attendance rates in the program year were lower than in the prior year for the majority of both middle school and high school students participating in CAPS in 1992-93. This raises more serious questions than TC recognized in July, 1993 about the effectiveness of the dropout prevention initiative at these levels. By contrast, evidence continues to point to the program's positive effect on participating elementary school students. Our questions about the middle schools and high schools have to be weighed along with the substantial qualitative evidence of the investment of many CBO and school staff in students' well being. Still more drastic changes may be called for in the structure, program, and climate of the secondary schools than CAPS and Project Achieve alone are able to effect. At the same time, monitoring and supporting students' attendance will continue to be an important component of any effective program. It is hoped that the knowledge gained from this follow-up study will contribute toward this end.

Table 1

Attendance Rate Changes Between 1991-92 and 1992-93 for CAPS Evaluation Samples

Fall TC *

	Gain	No change	Loss	N
Elementary Schools	73%	0%	27%	82
Middle Schools	56%	0%	44%	149
High Schools	40%	5%	55%	149
Overall	53%	2%	45%	380

Fall OER_T

	Gain	No change	Loss	N
Elementary Schools	65%	0%	35%	46
Middle Schools	52%	0%	48%	136
High Schools	37%	3%	60%	168
Overall	47%	1%	52%	350

Year OER_T

	Gain	No change	Loss	N
Elementary Schools	64%	0%	36%	45
Middle Schools	50%	0%	50%	131
High Schools	35%	2%	63%	158
Overall	45%	1%	54%	334

Fall OER_B

	Gain	No change	Loss	N
Elementary Schools	60%	0%	40%	63
Middle Schools	48%	0%	52%	208
High Schools	38%	3%	59%	194
Overall	45%	1%	54%	465

Year OER_B

	Gain	No change	Loss	N
Elementary Schools	64%	0%	36%	63
Middle Schools	43%	1%	56%	208
High Schools	35%	1%	64%	194
Overall	42%	1%	57%	465

---

* Note: Attendance data can be interpreted as follows:

Fall TC	Fall attendance data available from schools during the evaluation (i.e. available data subsample)
Fall OER_T	Fall Board of Education attendance data for students who were in the available data subsample
Year OER_T	Full year Board of Education attendance data for students who were in the available data subsample
Fall OER_B	Fall Board of Education attendance data for all students in original TC sample
Year OER_B	Full year Board of Education attendance data for all students in original TC sample.

TABLE 2A

CORRELATIONS OF ATTENDANCE RATES AND ATTENDANCE CHANGE RATES
FOR 1992-93 CAPS EVALUATION SAMPLES

OVERALL

	FALL 91	SPR 92	FALL 92	SPR 93	1991-92	1992-93	FALL CHANGE	SPRING CHANGE
SPR 92	.5063 (465) P= .000							
FALL 92	.4560 (465) P= .000	.5950 (465) P= .000						
SPR 93	.4304 (465) P= .000	.5980 (465) P= .000	.7406 (465) P= .000					
1991-92	.8303 (465) P= .000	.8892 (465) P= .000	.6082 (465) P= .000	.6036 (465) P= .000				
1992-93	.4686 (465) P= .000	.6342 (465) P= .000	.9096 (465) P= .000	.9451 (465) P= .000	.6434 (465) P= .000			
FALL CHANGE	-.3403 (465) P= .000	.2124 (465) P= .000	.6817 (465) P= .000	.4286 (465) P= .000	-.0400 (465) P= .195	.5758 (465) P= .000		
SPRING CHANGE	.0350 (465) P= .226	-.2365 (465) P= .000	.3257 (465) P= .000	.6373 (465) P= .000	-.1232 (465) P= .004	.5360 (465) P= .000	.3154 (465) P= .000	
YEAR CHANGE	-.1781 (465) P= .000	-.0190 (465) P= .342	.6046 (465) P= .000	.6551 (465) P= .000	-.1120 (465) P= .008	.6887 (465) P= .000	.7852 (465) P= .000	.8124 (465) P= .000

(Coefficient / (Cases) / 1-tailed Significance)

TABLE 2B

CORRELATIONS OF ATTENDANCE RATES AND ATTENDANCE CHANGE RATES
FOR 1992-93 CAPS EVALUATION SAMPLES

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

	FALL 91	SPR 92	FALL 92	SPR 93	1991-92	1992-93	FALL CHANGE	SPRING CHANGE
SPR 92	.4326 (63) P= .000							
FALL 92	.4077 (63) P= .000	.5587 (63) P= .000						
SPR 93	.3179 (63) P= .006	.4592 (63) P= .000	.5844 (63) P= .000					
1991-92	.8701 (63) P= .000	.8188 (63) P= .000	.5679 (63) P= .000	.4490 (63) P= .000				
1992-93	.4060 (63) P= .000	.5721 (63) P= .000	.8943 (63) P= .000	.8852 (63) P= .000	.5704 (63) P= .000			
FALL CHANGE	-.7760 (63) P= .000	-.0716 (63) P= .288	.2595 (63) P= .020	.0674 (63) P= .300	-.5280 (63) P= .000	.1883 (63) P= .070		
SPRING CHANGE	-.1545 (63) P= .113	-.6045 (63) P= .000	-.0437 (63) P= .367	.4301 (63) P= .000	-.4294 (63) P= .000	.2124 (63) P= .047	.1332 (63) P= .149	
YEAR CHANGE	-.6484 (63) P= .000	-.4341 (63) P= .000	.1597 (63) P= .106	.2912 (63) P= .010	-.6490 (63) P= .000	.2547 (63) P= .022	.7960 (63) P= .000	.7023 (63) P= .000

(Coefficient / (Cases) / 1-tailed Significance)

12

TABLE 2C

CORRELATIONS OF ATTENDANCE RATES AND ATTENDANCE CHANGE RATES
FOR 1992-93 CAPS EVALUATION SAMPLES

MIDDLE SCHOOL

	FALL 91	SPR 92	FALL 92	SPR 93	1991-92	1992-93	FALL CHANGE	SPRING CHANGE
SPR 92	.2966 (208) P= .000							
FALL 92	.3250 (208) P= .000	.4787 (208) P= .000						
SPR 93	.3496 (208) P= .000	.5750 (208) P= .000	.6984 (208) P= .000					
1991-92	.7001 (208) P= .000	.8620 (208) P= .000	.5132 (208) P= .000	.6021 (208) P= .000				
1992-93	.3652 (208) P= .000	.5723 (208) P= .000	.9157 (208) P= .000	.9261 (208) P= .000	.6061 (208) P= .000			
FALL CHANGE	-.3218 (208) P= .000	.2873 (208) P= .000	.7909 (208) P= .000	.4729 (208) P= .000	.0607 (208) P= .192	.6804 (208) P= .000		
SPRING CHANGE	.1299 (208) P= .031	-.2721 (208) P= .000	.3674 (208) P= .000	.6308 (208) P= .000	-.1094 (208) P= .058	.5465 (208) P= .000	.2838 (208) P= .000	
YEAR CHANGE	-.1168 (208) P= .047	.0102 (208) P= .442	.7276 (208) P= .000	.6677 (208) P= .000	-.0607 (208) P= .192	.7571 (208) P= .000	.8040 (208) P= .000	.7757 (208) P= .000

(Coefficient / (Cases) / 1-tailed Significance)

TABLE 2D

CORRELATIONS OF ATTENDANCE RATES AND ATTENDNACE CHANGE RATES
FOR 1992-93 CAPS EVALUATION SAMPLES

HIGH SCHOOL

	FALL 91	SPR 92	FALL 92	SPR 93	1991-92	1992-93	FALL CHANGE	SPRING CHANGE
SPR 92	.5582 (194) P= .000							
FALL 92	.5066 (194) P= .000	.6436 (194) P= .000						
SPR 93	.4189 (194) P= .000	.5389 (194) P= .000	.7429 (194) P= .000					
1991-92	.8823 (194) P= .000	.8800 (194) P= .000	.6417 (194) P= .000	.5420 (194) P= .000				
1992-93	.4825 (194) P= .000	.6202 (194) P= .000	.8914 (194) P= .000	.9526 (194) P= .000	.6196 (194) P= .000			
FALL CHANGE	-.3381 (194) P= .000	.2051 (194) P= .002	.6401 (194) P= .000	.4376 (194) P= .000	-.0858 (194) P= .117	.5430 (194) P= .000		
SPRING CHANGE	.0414 (194) P= .283	-.1733 (194) P= .008	.3515 (194) P= .000	.7363 (194) P= .000	-.0733 (194) P= .155	.6155 (194) P= .000	.3468 (194) P= .000	
YEAR CHANGE	-.1602 (194) P= .013	.0165 (194) P= .409	.5693 (194) P= .000	.7343 (194) P= .000	-.0893 (194) P= .108	.7264 (194) P= .000	.7642 (194) P= .000	.8452 (194) P= .000

(Coefficient / (Cases) / 1-tailed Significance)